

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/806,256	03/23/2004	Kazuhiro Shimawaki	4468-012B	1914
	7590 05/15/200 FMAN GILMAN & BE	EXAMINER		
1700 Diagonal Road, Suite 300 Alexandria, VA 22314			PERILLA, JASON M	
Alexandra, VA	1 22314		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
•			2611	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			05/15/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

			11	
			<u>55 </u>	
	Application No.	Applicant(s).		
	10/806,256	SHIMAWAKI, KAZUHIRO	AWAKI, KAZUHIRO	
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit		
	Jason M. Perilla	2611		
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	pears on the cover sheet w	ith the correspondence address		
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING D. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.1 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period or - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNI 136(a). In no event, however, may a will apply and will expire SIX (6) MOI e, cause the application to become A	CATION. reply be timely filed NTHS from the mailing date of this communication. BANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).		
Status				
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 16 M	<u>1arch 2007</u> .			
2a) ☐ This action is FINAL . 2b) ☑ This	s action is non-final.			
3) Since this application is in condition for allowa	nce except for formal mat	ters, prosecution as to the merits is		
closed in accordance with the practice under E	Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.[D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.		
Disposition of Claims				
4)	wn from consideration.			
Application Papers				
9) The specification is objected to by the Examine	er.			
10)⊠ The drawing(s) filed on 23 March 2004 is/are:	•	•		
Applicant may not request that any objection to the		· ·		
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct	·	•		
11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex	xammer. Note the attache	d Office Action of John PTO-152.	•	
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119	•			
 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority document 2. Certified copies of the priority document 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority 	ts have been received. ts have been received in A	Application No. <u>09/712,844</u> .		
application from the International Burea				
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list	of the certified copies no	received.	•	
Attachment(s)				
Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)		Summary (PTO-413) (s)/Mail Date		

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office PTOL-326 (Rev. 08-06)

Paper No(s)/Mail Date _

3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)

Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____. 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application

6) Other: ____.

Application/Control Number: 10/806,256

Art Unit: 2611

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 4, 5, 9, 10, 14, 15, 19, and 20 are pending in the instant application.

Response to Amendment/Comment

2. The indication of allowable subject matter made in the first office action has been withdrawn in view of the newly cited reference Masumoto et al (U.S. Pat. No. 5809094).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) are summarized as follows:

- 1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
- 2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
- 3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
- 4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.
- 4. Claims 4, 5, 9, 10, 14, 15, 19, and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Masumoto et al (U.S. Pat. No. 5809094; hereafter "Masumoto").

Regarding claim 1, Masumoto discloses a reception data synchronizing apparatus according to figure 1, for a synchronization to be obtained between reception data (input to "DATA BUFFER" 1) having a plurality of synchronism patterns and

Art Unit: 2611

expectation data or "a predetermined offset word" as an expected value of the reception data (col. 4, lines 1-5), comprising: a phase recording means (5, 6) for recording second synchronism pattern detecting timing (6) at which a second of the plurality of the synchronism patterns is detected in the reception data and a first synchronism pattern detecting timing (5), as an initial one at which a first of the plurality of synchronism patterns is initially detected in the reception data (col. 4, lines 59-65; col. 5, lines 4-11); a timing generating means (8) for generating a timing for decision; and a collation and synchronism decision means (2) for collating the reception data with the expectation data or "predetermined offset word" to decide whether or not the reception data is consistent in phase with the expectation data according to the timing for decision (col. 4, lines 1-5), wherein the timing for decision is the first synchronism pattern detecting timing before the collation and synchronism decision means collates the reception data with the expectation data (col. 5, lines 4-11), and wherein the timing for decision is a timing obtained by replacing the first synchronism pattern detecting timing with the second synchronism pattern detecting timing recorded in the phase recording means (5, 6), when the collation and synchronism decision means gives a decision for inconsistency in phase (col. 6, line 24 - col. 7, line 50). Masumoto discloses a synchronization apparatus wherein input data is correlated with a known "predetermined offset word" or expected synchronism pattern. Once a first synchronization timing is made according to a match with the "predetermined offset word" by the collation decision means (2), the timing is stored in the "MAIN SYNCRONIZATION DETECTION CIRCUIT" (5) as a first timing of the synchronism timing. Thereafter, when a second

Art Unit: 2611

synchronization timing is determined by the decision means (2), it is stored in the "SUBORDINATE SYNCRONIZATION DETECTION CIRCUIT" (fig. 1, ref. 6; col. 5, lines 4-10) as a second timing of the synchronism timing. Finally, in the case that the first timing is determined to be incorrect, the timing generation means (8) of the apparatus switches from the first "MAIN" timing to the second "SUBORDINATE" timing (col. 6, lines 3-10).

Although Masumoto discloses a phase recording means recording each of the first and second timings, a "phase difference recording means" for recording a phase timing difference between the first and second timings is not disclosed. Furthermore, Masumoto discloses switching between the first and second synchronization timings if a finding of phase inconsistency is made rather than shifting the first synchronism timing by the phase difference between the first and second timings. Hence, the difference between the prior art reference Masumoto and the instant application is only that the instant application records a "difference" between two timings while Masumoto records each of the timings individually. Thereafter, when an "inconsistency in phase" is determined (that is, the first timing is found to be incorrect) the prior are reference Masumoto replaces the recorded first timing with the recorded second timing while the instant application discloses shifting the first timing by the difference between the first and second timings.

Furthermore, Hiramatsu discloses an analogous synchronization apparatus wherein a frame timing difference between a transmitter and receiver is determined (col. 3, lines 34-37). The differences between the prior art reference Masumoto and the

Art Unit: 2611

instant application being slight, only a small level of skill in the art would be required to modify the prior art reference Masumoto as suggested by Hiramatsu to gather "phase difference" information between two timings rather than two the two timings separately. Finally, the specification does not provide any secondary indications of nonobviousness such as (1) the invention's commercial success, (2) long felt but unresolved needs, (3) the failure of others, (4) skepticism by experts, (5) praise by others, (6) teaching away by others, (7) recognition of a problem, or (8) copying of the invention by competitors. Specifically, the specification of the instant application does not disclose that the recording of a "phase difference" between two timings rather than the two timings separately provides and particular advantage or solves any particular problem beyond the prior art reference Matsumoto. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time which the invention was made to determine a "phase difference" between the two timings of Matsumoto as suggested by Hiramatsu to arrive at the claimed invention because, the differences between the prior art reference Matsumoto and the claimed invention being very small, the analogous prior art references (i.e. Hiramatsu) evidencing alternative methods of recording phase timing differences, and the lack of secondary factors of nonobviousness in the instant application, it is within the level of skill of one having ordinary skill in the art to combine the prior art references Matsumoto and Hiramatsu to arrive at the claimed invention.

Regarding claims 5, 9, 10, 14, 15, 19, and 20, the limitations of the claims are disclosed by Matsumoto in view of Hiramatsu as applied in claim 4 above.

Application/Control Number: 10/806,256 Page 6

Art Unit: 2611

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jason M. Perilla whose telephone number is (571) 272-3055. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8-5 EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Chieh M. Fan can be reached on (571) 272-3042. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Jason M. Perilla May 2, 2007

jmp

CHIEH M. FAN
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER